

St. Olaf Non-Instructional Group

CATEGORY 1: Campus Mission

Rubric Score:	1	2	3	4	5
1A. Functions and activities	Most functions and activities are not essential	Some functions and activities are essential	Most functions and activities are essential	Significant functions and activities are essential	N/A
1A. Program aligned to Mission	Program is not aligned with the mission	Program is somewhat aligned with the mission	Program is aligned with mission	Program is exceptionally aligned with the mission	N/A
1A. Program goals and progress towards achieving	Program goals are unclear and/or no progress has been made toward achieving them	Program goals could be clearer but some progress has been made toward achieving them	Program goals are clear and some progress has been made toward achieving them	Program goals are clear and significant progress has been made toward achieving them	N/A
1B. Mandated Activities	Program has no mandated activities	Program has minimal mandated activities	Program has mandated activities	Program has significant mandated activities	N/A

General Comments:

CATEGORY 2: Demand

Rubric Score:	1	2	3	4	5
2A What constituencies are served (students, faculty, staff, alumni, parents, visitors/guests) and size of constituencies served	1 Campus Constituency	2 Campus Constituencies	3 to 4 Campus Constituencies	5+ Campus Constituencies	N/A
2A Change in demand	Declining	No Change	Slight Increase (< 10%)	Significant Increase (> 10%)	N/A
2A. Estimated Future Demand	Declining	No Change	Slight Increase (< 10%)	Significant Increase (> 10%)	N/A
2A. Method Used to Determine Demand	Not measuring or no data.	Not measure or no data but provided guess.	Measuring user demand but not using information to project future program development.	Measuring user demand systematically and using the information to project future program development	N/A
2B. Other programs on campus with which program has the most interaction.	Absence of program would have no negative impact on other internal programs	Absence of program would have slight negative impact on other internal programs	Absence of program would have significant negative impact on other internal programs	Absence of program would have severe negative impact on other internal programs	N/A
2C. Other programs that are providing a service or function similar to those you provide.	There are programs that provide identical services/functions.	There are programs that provide largely similar services/functions.	There are programs that provide some similar services/functions	There are <i>no</i> programs that provide similar services/functions.	N/A
2C. Describe how positions could be shared across areas.	Functions could be assumed by other staff on campus.	There is a staff sharing possibility.	There is some potential for staff sharing opportunities.	There are no possible staff sharing opportunities.	N/A
2C. Staff sharing impact	Staff sharing would have minimal or no impact on program, service, or constituents	Staff sharing would have a slight negative impact on program, service, or constituents	Staff sharing would have a negative impact on program, service, or constituents	Staff sharing would have significant negative on program or service	N/A

General Comments (Demand):

CATEGORY 3: Quality and Cost Measures

Rubric Score:	1	2	3	4	5
3A. Use of benchmarks or other quality indicators.	No defined benchmarks or quality indicators are used.	Some defined benchmarks or quality indicators are used.	Many defined benchmarks or quality indicators are used.	Significant defined benchmarks or quality indicators are used.	N/A
3A. Performance against those benchmarks and quality indicators.	No ability to measure performance or benchmarks not met.	Some benchmarks met	Many benchmarks met	All benchmarks met	N/A
3A. Manage budget appropriately over/on/under.	Over budget >10%	Slightly over budget <0-10%	On budget	Under budget	N/A
3A. Describe how you measure cost-effectiveness	No measurement	Some measurement	Moderate measurement	High level of measurement	N/A
3B. Processes or services due for review, re-engineering, or removal.	No processes mentioned	Minimal processes mentioned	Some processes mentioned	Many processes mentioned	N/A
3B. Possible savings or enhancements.	No savings or enhancements identified	Minimal savings or enhancements identified	Some savings or enhancements identified	Many savings or enhancements identified	N/A

General Comments:

CATEGORY 4: Operational Effectiveness

Rubric Score:	1	2	3	4	5
4A. Strategies to reduce hospitality costs and impact on program, services or constituents	No strategies identified to implement cost savings or operate more efficiently	Some strategies identified to implement cost savings or operate more efficiently	Many strategies identified to implement cost savings or operate more efficiently	Significant strategies identified to implement cost savings or operate more efficiently	N/A
4B. Professional Development Expenses	Professional development is not critical to operations.	Professional development is somewhat important to operations.	Professional development is important to operations.	Professional development is critical to operations.	N/A
4B. Strategies to reduce professional development expenses.	Reductions should have no impact on operations.	Reductions would have slight negative impact on operations.	Reductions would have negative impact on operations	Reductions would have significant negative impact on operations	N/A
4C. Contracts and Memberships.	Contracts not reviewed for cost efficiencies.	Some contracts have been reviewed for cost efficiencies.	Many contracts have been reviewed for cost efficiencies.	All contracts have been reviewed for cost efficiencies.	N/A
4C. Strategies to reduce contract and membership expenses.	Reductions should have no impact on operations.	Reductions would have slight negative impact on operations.	Reductions would have negative impact on operations	Reductions would have significant negative impact on operations	N/A
4D. Consultants and Independent Contractors	Program uses a significant number of consultants and contractors.	Program uses a number of consultants or contractors.	Program uses minimal consultants and contractors and reductions.	Program does not use consultants or independent contractors.	N/A
4D. Strategies to reduce consultants and independent contractors.	Reductions should have no impact on operations.	Reductions would have slight negative impact on operations.	Reductions would have negative impact on operations	Reductions would have significant negative impact on operations	N/A
4E. Use of student employees to reduce costs?	Additional student employees would not reduce costs.	Additional student employees would reduce costs slightly without compromising the quality of the program.	Additional student employees would reduce staff costs some without compromising the quality of the program.	Additional student employees would reduce staff costs significantly without the compromising the quality of the program.	N/A

General Comments (Operational Effectiveness):

--

Category 5: Staffing

Rubric Score:	1	2	3	4	5
5B. Areas where staff could be retrained/re-deployment or replaced with temporary staff.	Program has considered many opportunities for re-training/re-deployment or replacement with temporary staff.	Program has considered some opportunities for re-training/re-deployment or replacement with temporary staff.	Program has considered a few opportunities for re-training/re-deployment or replacement with temporary staff.	Program has not considered re-training/re-deployment or replacement with temporary staff.	N/A
5C. Describe opportunities for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of staff	No opportunities identified	Evidence of a few opportunities, but no evidence of plans for staff efficiency	Evidence of some opportunities identified and evidence of plans for staff efficiency	Evidence of many opportunities identified and evidence of plans for staff efficiency	N/A
5D. Collaboration with Carleton and other outside groups.	No attempts to collaborate with others.	Some collaborative processes in place.	Modest collaborative processes in place.	Significant collaboration and cost savings	N/A
5E. Impact of staffing reduction.	No impact on core services to constituents	Reduction would have a slight negative impact on core service to constituents	Reduction would have a negative impact on core service to constituents	Significant impact on core service to constituents.	N/A

General Comments:

--

CATEGORY 6: Opportunity Analysis

Rubric Score:	1	2	3	4	5
6A. Work done to contain or reduce costs in the past three years.	No cost-saving opportunities performed <i>(0% of total program budget)</i>	Cost-savings measured and implemented with limited cost-savings <i>(1-2% of total program budget)</i>	Cost-savings measured and implemented with moderate cost-savings <i>(3-5% of total program budget)</i>	Cost-savings measured and implemented with substantial cost-savings <i>(5% or greater of total program budget)</i>	N/A
6A. Opportunities to reduce costs going forward.	No cost-saving opportunities identified <i>(0% of total program budget)</i>	Opportunities identified with limited cost-savings <i>(1-2% of total program budget)</i>	Opportunities identified with moderate cost-savings <i>(3-5% of total program budget)</i>	Opportunities identified with substantial cost-savings <i>(5% or greater of total program budget)</i>	N/A
6B. Additional revenue or resource generation.	No opportunities identified for additional revenue or resource generation	Limited opportunities for additional revenue and/or resource generation identified	Moderate opportunities for additional revenue and/or resource generation identified	Substantial opportunities for additional revenue and/or resource generation identified	N/A
6C. Synergies or collaborations.	No opportunities identified.	Limited opportunities identified for reducing costs through synergies or collaborations.	Moderate opportunities for reducing costs through synergies or collaborations	Substantial opportunities for reducing costs through synergies or collaborations	N/A
6D. Describe what it would take to make the program exemplary.	No opportunities identified	Evidence of a general plan	Evidence of a clear plan with future actions identified	Clear plan with specific and achievable actions as part of an ongoing continuous improvement process	N/A

General Comments:

Other Comments, Suggestions or Ideas: